

IGNATIUS, POLYCARP, AND I CLEMENT: WALTER BAUER RECONSIDERED

BY

FREDERICK W. NORRIS

Walter Bauer's attack on the classical theory of the development of heresy remains impressive. The claim of some early Christian writers that everywhere heresy was both later in time and smaller in number than orthodoxy appears to be untenable to many scholars.¹ Even H.E.W. Turner contested the report that heresy only flourished in a few places, although he vigorously defended orthodoxy's priority.² The historical reconstructions which Bauer offered, however, continue to be debated. His assessment of the evidence resulted in two theses. 1) In most areas of the Mediterranean basin – particularly Edessa, Egypt, Asia Minor, Antioch, Macedonia, and Crete – heresy was either earlier than and/or stronger than orthodoxy. 2) From the beginning of the second century the Roman community was singularly the dominant influence in the formation of orthodoxy.³ My purpose is to examine Bauer's treatment of

¹ Walter Bauer, *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten Christentum*, Beiträge zur historischen Theologie, 10, zweite, durchgesehene Auflage mit einem Nachtrag, herausgegeben von Georg Strecker (Tübingen, J.C.B. Mohr/Paul Siebeck, 1964) 3–4 mentions Origen, *Comm. II in Cantic.* (see Baehrens, GCS 33, 179) and *Sel. in Prov.* (see Lommatsch 13, 228), Tertullian, *De praescr. haer.* 36, and Hegesippus in Eusebius, *H.E.* 4,22,2–6 as espousing the so-called classical theory of the development of heresy. Reviews of and responses to Bauer are cited in Georg Strecker, *Die Aufnahme des Buches*, in *Rechtgläubigkeit*, 288–306. The American translation by the Philadelphia Seminar on Christian Origins, *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity*, ed. by Robert A. Kraft and Gerhard Krodel (Philadelphia, Fortress Press, 1971) – published in England by SCM in 1972 – contains a “completely revised and expanded” version of Strecker's essay by Robert Kraft, 286–316. Helmut Koester, *Häretiker im Urchristentum*, *RGK*³ III, 17–21 has an extensive list of works influenced by Bauer.

² H.E.W. Turner, *The Pattern of Christian Truth: A Study in the Relations between Orthodoxy and Heresy in the Early Church*, Bampton Lectures 1954 (London, A.R. Mowbray & Co. Ltd., 1954) 7.

³ Bauer, *Rechtgläubigkeit*. These theses are most easily seen in Bauer's own precis of his book, *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten Christentum*, *Aufsätze und Kleine Schriften*, herausgegeben von Georg Strecker (Tübingen, J.C.B. Mohr/Paul Siebeck,

selected sources from Antioch, Asia Minor, and Rome in order to reconsider both the method by which he arrived at these theses and the theses themselves.

I. "ORTHODOXY": A MINORITY IN ANTIOCH AND ASIA MINOR

The way in which Bauer employed the terms "orthodoxy" and "heresy" has been a point of contention even for those who accepted his insights. The legitimacy of that criticism will be discussed below. Here attention is directed to the claim which Bauer makes that the supporters of Ignatius and Polycarp were probably a minority in Antioch and Asia Minor. His claim may be summarized as follows. Ignatius' frantic concern for his allies is best explained against the background of a minority whose very existence is threatened. The argumentation which he put forward for monarchical episcopacy is typical of minority groups. Although it is possible that Ignatius' friends represented a plurality in the various cities to which and about which he wrote, his frenzied activity in behalf of his supporters and his overwrought exhortations to them, suggest that this was not the case. Antiochene "orthodoxy" must have been seriously endangered. Nothing else could have called forth Ignatius' unparalleled request from every congregation known to him for representatives or at least letters to be sent to Antioch. The peril was depicted so clearly that bishop Polycarp wanted to leave troubled Smyrna and himself travel as a delegate to Antioch. On the basis of these texts, Bauer concluded that "orthodoxy" in both Western Syria and Asia Minor was of questionable size and influence.⁴

Bauer himself changed his estimation of the number of those supporting Ignatius. First, he viewed the possibility of their being a majority as unlikely because of Ignatius' frantic arguments and efforts. Then he suggested that they probably comprised smaller or larger majorities in Ephesus, Magnesia, Tralles, and Philadelphia.⁵ The unquestioned concession of probable majorities favoring Ignatius in Ephesus, Magnesia, Tralles, and Philadelphia has two results. 1) Bauer's claim that Ignatius' views developed from minorities cannot be substantiated on his own reading of the evidence, unless he can prove that these three cities had

1967) 229-233. Hans-Dietrich Altendorf, *Zum Stichwort: Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten Christentum*, *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* (1969) 62-63 gives a similar summary of Bauer.

⁴ Bauer, *Rechtgläubigkeit*, 65-78.

⁵ Pp. 67, 73, and 81.

“orthodox” minorities prior to Ignatius, or demonstrate that there were no truly monarchical bishops in those communities. Bauer made no attempt to argue that prior to the time of Ignatius, Magnesia, Tralles, and Philadelphia had “orthodox” minorities. He tried to indicate that Ephesus could have been no “center or orthodoxy” before Ignatius. If that could be established – which I doubt⁶ – it would still not be definitive evidence that Ignatius’ argument arises from a minority situation. Bauer had already conceded that Ephesus probably had a majority agreeing with Ignatius’ views when the Syrian wrote. Bauer’s assertion that there were nor real bishops in these cities will be handled below. 2) He could still claim that Ignatius’ arguments for monepiscopacy come from a threatened minority, if he could establish the minority status of “orthodoxy” in Smyrna and Antioch prior to and during the time of Ignatius.

The texts relating to Smyrna do indicate a struggle. It is possible that both in *Smyrneans* 6,1 and *Polycarp* 1,2 the use of *topos* refers to a significant leader or leaders who were performing cultic acts outside Polycarp’s jurisdiction. The opening of Polycarp’s letter to the Philippians also may be evidence for counter-leadership.⁷ Bauer posited a “gnostic anti-bishop” or someone acting in that way although he did not wish to quarrel about semantics.⁸ These details, however, are not enough to warrant the conclusion that in Smyrna, Polycarp and those supporting Ignatius’ supporters in Smyrna also comprised a majority. Decisively, as firmly in the way of demonstrating their minority status. *Smyrneans* 10 indicates that the Smyrneans unlike the Philadelphians had received Ignatius’ representatives quite well. Both Philo and Rheus wished to express their thankfulness for the way in which they were treated by the Smyrnan congregation. If, as Bauer conceded, the supporters of Ignatius were a probable majority in Philadelphia, and yet did not treat Ignatius’ representatives as well as the congregation in Smyrna, it is possible that Ignatius’ supporters in Smyrna also comprised a majority. Decisively, as in Philadelphia, Ignatius was so certain of the proper faith and strength of the Smyrneans that he asked them to appoint a delegate to be sent to congratulate the congregation in Antioch. If Ignatius had felt that the

⁶ I argue the weakness of Bauer’s case concerning Ephesus in “Asia Minor Before Ignatius: Walter Bauer Reconsidered”, to be published in *Studia Evangelica*, papers from the Fifth International Congress on Biblical Studies, Oxford, 3–7 September 1973.

⁷ Bauer, *Rechtgläubigkeit*, 73–74. Turner, *The Pattern of Christian Truth*, 64 contests both points.

⁸ Bauer, *Rechtgläubigkeit*, 73.

Smyrneans would have had any difficulty in appointing a faithful delegate, he certainly would not have requested them to send one to his beloved Antiochenes.⁹ Furthermore, since Bauer insisted that in Smyrna during Polycarp's lifetime there was no "separation between ecclesiastical Christianity and heresy",¹⁰ on his reading of the evidence, there was no "heretical" group outside the community to which Ignatius wrote. Therefore, Bauer has been unable to prove that ecclesiastical Christianity was a minority among the Christians in Smyrna.

The situation in Antioch reflects the same kinds of difficulties seen in Smyrna, although we have little direct evidence about conditions there. In this instance, however, Bauer misinterpreted the information we possess. Ignatius did not seek representatives or letters to be sent to Antioch from every church open to him. In his epistle to Polycarp, he did ask Polycarp to write churches on his route to Rome since the journey from Troas to Neapolis came much sooner than he had anticipated. One purpose of these requested letters was to ask congregations to send representatives or messages to Antioch.¹¹ The reference to "bishops, presbyters, and deacons" in *Philadelphians* 10, however, states that "the nearest churches have sent bishops, and the others presbyters and deacons". Bauer, in his handbook treating the Ignatian epistles, understood "nearest" to refer not to Philadelphia or Troas, the city from which the letter to Philadelphia was written, but rather to Antioch.¹² If this interpretation is correct, bishops were only sent from churches near Antioch. Presbyters and deacons came from the more distant churches. This interpretation is supported by the fact that nowhere in his letters did Ignatius ask a bishop to go as a messenger. The Philadelphian letter specifically requests that a deacon be appointed.¹³ Ignatius sought a delegate from Smyrna, but Tralles, Ephesus, and Rome were encouraged to pray for the church in Syria.¹⁴ The letter to the Magnesians contains a cryptic phrase of purpose, concerning the refreshment of the Antiochene congregation with the dew of the Magnesian congregation, but that purpose is related to prayer.¹⁵ Therefore, of the six churches to which Ignatius wrote, four were in no

⁹ *Smyrneans* 11. Compare *Philadelphians* 10.

¹⁰ Bauer, *Rechtgläubigkeit*, 75.

¹¹ *Polycarp* 8,1.

¹² Walter Bauer, *Die Briefe des Ignatius von Antiochia und der Polykarpbrief*, *Handbuch zum neuen Testament* (Tübingen, J.C.B. Mohr/Paul Siebeck, 1920) 262.

¹³ *Philadelphians* 10,1.

¹⁴ *Smyrneans* 11,2; *Trallians* 13,1; *Ephesians* 21,2; *Romans* 9,1.

¹⁵ *Magnesians* 14,1.

way requested to send either representatives or letters. Only two were asked to send delegates. The letters written from Troas: *Philadelphians*, *Smyrneans*, and *Polycarp*, make mention of either representatives or letters.

At this point Bauer might have claimed that something important occurred just before the final letters were written which caused Ignatius to change his strategy. In that case, the purpose of the delegates and/or letters would have had to have been investigated. This, however, Bauer ignored. In both the Smyranean and Philadelphian epistles, the purpose was to congratulate the Antiochenes for the resolution of their problems.¹⁶ The congratulations were "that they have gained peace, and have restored their proper greatness, and that their proper constitution has been restored".¹⁷ Such statements suggest earlier unrest in Antioch, and perhaps reflect problems Ignatius had there as bishop. The peace may have been shaky. Ignatius was indeed concerned, but he also was satisfied that the present condition was proper. The news of peace in Antioch was what prompted sending messengers. The possibility of Ignatius' supporters being "routed from the field" or being "driven back" without him,¹⁸ would have been more likely when the first letters were written, i.e., before the news of peace had arrived. Yet it is precisely these first letters from Ignatius which ask neither for delegates nor for letters to Antioch.

Bauer was impressed also by the fact that so many delegates were requested even to the rank of bishop from churches which were themselves in danger. The only mention of bishops is in *Philadelphians* 10 which Bauer read as a reference to churches near Antioch. He did not attempt to demonstrate that these anonymous churches near Antioch were threatened. His example of a troubled bishop was Polycarp, whom Bauer thought "would have preferred to undertake the journey to Antioch in person" because Ignatius had so strongly stressed the necessity of such delegates.¹⁹ Ignatius did ask Polycarp to call a council and select a zealous and beloved person to act as God's courier to Antioch.²⁰ Ignatius, however, did not ask Polycarp to go. In *Polycarp* 8 he says: "I greet him who shall be appointed to go to Syria. Grace will be with him through all, and with Polycarp, who sends him." Furthermore, Polycarp

¹⁶ *Smyrneans* 11,2; *Philadelphians* 10,1.

¹⁷ *Smyrneans* 11,2.

¹⁸ Bauer, *Rechtgläubigkeit*, 69.

¹⁹ P. 68-69.

²⁰ *Polycarp* 8,2.

was so unimpressed with the necessity of his undertaking the task, that in his letter to the Philippians he says, "I will do this if I have a convenient opportunity, either myself or the one whom I am sending representing you and me."²¹ Those are not the words of a man who saw the survival of the Antiochene church endangered or one who was so worried about the state of things in Smyrna that he could not leave that city. The "orthodox" community in Antioch had experienced serious difficulties, but Bauer did not assemble evidence which proves that the conditions there prior to Ignatius' epistles demand an "orthodox" minority.²² At the time of the writing of Ignatius' letters, neither the tone of his arguments nor the scope of his actions establish the fact that he represented a threatened minority.

In the consideration of Bauer's description of the Christian communities in Antioch and Asia Minor, three points, then, are in order. First, in both areas he has been unable to demonstrate either the priority or the majority of "heresy". Ignatius and Polycarp indicate concern about "wrong" teaching and practice, but those supporting them in the Asia Minor and Western Syrian cities which their writings reflect, probably represented majorities. Secondly, the attempt to assess minorities and priorities among "orthodox" and "heretical" communities was and is important in order to deal with the classical theory of the development of heresy. That theory will continue to hold sway until such evidence is accumulated and assessed. This assessment, however, cannot be bound to a sociological theory which views arguments for monepiscopacy to be indicative of minorities. In this period all Christians of any description were in the minority. Small groups pressured by the larger culture, may see themselves as threatened even by the smallest amount of opposition from within. One or two influential people can change the whole direction of such a group. The situation which Bauer posited, a democratic *Sitz im Leben* in which control of the council has been lost, is not necessary to explain either the deep concern of Ignatian texts, or the concern of any other texts. Since Bauer has not established an "orthodox" minority within the communities in which bishops were present, nor in Ignatius'

²¹ *Philippians* 13,1.

²² Bauer, *Rechtgläubigkeit*, 67 saw the dispute between Peter and Paul (Galatians 2,11-21), the fact that Paul never again spoke of Antioch, and the cryptic reference to Antioch in Acts 18,22-23 as evidence against the possibility of Ignatius being a monarchical bishop. But he did not demonstrate that "orthodoxy" was a minority in Antioch prior to Ignatius.

home Antioch, then he has not demonstrated that Ignatius' arguments for monepiscopacy come from a threatened minority within the various sectors of Christianity. Bauer attempted to shore up that description by claiming that there were no real bishops in those communities, but failed to establish that claim, as we shall see. Thirdly, none of the evidence discussed demonstrates that "orthodoxy" was a majority throughout Asia Minor and Western Syria. The texts only indicate that "orthodoxy" was probably a majority in the specific cities mentioned. Bauer cannot claim that "orthodoxy" in these cities was threatened with extinction. On the other hand, one cannot claim that "heresy" was without power and influence in the regions, and possibly in the majority in some places. The ultimate question of plurality in these areas cannot be answered. In order to distinguish these adversaries, however, the question as to whether or not the categories of "orthodoxy" and "heresy" are even applicable to early Christianity must be examined.

II. "HERESY" AND MONEPISCOPACY

In his introduction Bauer stated that he employed the terms "orthodoxy" and "heresy" in a way which was consistent with their customary usage.²³ Using the terms in that context allowed him to emphasize the strength and priority of "heresy" in particular regions of the Mediterranean basin. Still he was careful to insist that later meanings of the terms were not applicable. He specifically denied that either Ignatius or Polycarp had a conception of "heretics" being excluded from the Church, and insisted that both made unity and reconciliation their primary goals.²⁴ Although the phrase "catholic church" was used for the first time in ecclesiastical history by Ignatius, it was employed in an inclusive sense rather than the exclusive sense in which it was to appear in the Muratorian Canon at the end of the second century.²⁵ Bauer viewed the absence of a division between "inside" and "outside" as an indication that Ignatius, the "bishop of Syria", would have had to claim all the baptized believers in Syria under his hegemony. Since there were many Gnostic teachers in Antioch, as well as other strong religious influences, it then became clear to Bauer that Ignatius could not have been a bishop worthy of the title.²⁶ Polycarp suffered the same fate since no separation between "heresy" and

²³ Bauer, *Rechtgläubigkeit*, 2-3.

²⁴ Pp. 67 and 75.

²⁵ P. 231.

²⁶ Pp. 67-71.

"orthodoxy" occurred within his lifetime. He also must have claimed all the "heretics" in Smyrna to be under his jurisdiction, and therefore could hardly be considered a powerful monarchical bishop in light of "heretical" strength in that city. If these two champions were not truly bishops, then it is unlikely that those Ignatius mentions as bishops in other cities could properly wear the title.²⁷

Bauer is probably correct in asserting that no clear separation between "orthodoxy" and "heresy" can be constructed from the Ignatian and Polycarp letters. The observation about the different meanings of the term "catholic church" in Ignatius and the Muratorian Canon is important in tracing developments in early Christianity. There are, however, developments which Bauer overlooked, precisely because he stated the issue in terms of separation or division. He insisted that the word "heresy" when it appears in Ignatius means "Sekte" rather than "Ketzeri".²⁸ This is consistent with his later contention that Ignatius considered the opponents to be inside the community of faith. Both Lampe and Grant, however, point out that the term means "Ketzeri". Ehrhardt suggests that particularly in Tralles a separation between Ignatius' supporters and opponents had occurred because no word of reconciliation appears in the Trallian epistle.²⁹ There is no call to re-

²⁷ Pp. 75-76 and 71-72.

²⁸ Bauer, *Die Briefe*, 235 concerning *Trallians* 6,1.

²⁹ G. W. H. Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1968) 51 and Robert M. Grant, *The Apostolic Fathers: New Translation and Commentary*, Vol. 4, *Ignatius of Antioch* (London, Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1966) 76 in reference to *Trallians* 6,1. Arnold Ehrhardt, *Christianity before the Apostles' Creed, The Framework of the New Testament Stories* (Manchester, University Press, 1964) 180-181 views the word "heresy" as meaning "sect" but claims that there was a separation in Tralles in which the opponents appear to have been "irretrievably lost". The comparison in which the word occurs in *Trallians* 6,1 is strong evidence for its use in the sense of "Ketzeri". *Ephesians* 6,2 is enigmatic, as is *Hermas Sim.* 9,23,5. Neither of those references supplies a clear context in which to determine the exact meaning. I Clement 14,2 has used the term to mean "strife" or "party spirit". Ἐτεροδοξία as a noun in *Magnesians* 8,1 and in verb form in *Smyrneans* 6,2 only appears in Ignatius among the so called "Apostolic Fathers" in the sense of "another or irregular opinion". His letter to Polycarp 3,1 employs ἑτεροδιδασκαλέω. I Clement 11,2 uses ἑτερογνώμων of Lot's wife, indicating a "change of mind". *Hermas, Man.* 6,1,2 contrasts the two ways with the use of ὁρθός. J. B. Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers*, Vol. II. Sect. 1 (London, Macmillan and Co., 1885) 28 on the basis of the Syriac and Armenian translations emended Ignatius' *Ephesians* 1,1 with the phrase ἐν γνώμῃ ὁρθῇ καὶ. If his emendation were correct, that would be the closest approximation of the term "orthodoxy" to appear in the "Apostolic Fathers". The word "orthodoxy" itself does not occur. Although word studies without strong contextual evidence are misleading, this collection suggested by the references in

pentance in that letter, and the contrast in which the word “heresy” appears is one between “Christian food” and that “strange plant, which is heresy”. In the same letter, further distinction is made between those who are inside the sanctuary with the bishop, presbytery, deacons, and ordinances of the Apostles, and those who are outside the sanctuary. The latter are not of pure conscience. In addition the advice is explicitly given to beware of these people, to be deaf to what they say and to flee from their teachings.³⁰

The Trallian letter, then, distinguishes between outside and inside by viewing the adversaries as outside. The names which Ignatius calls his opponents throughout his epistles tend to strengthen this image. The “atheists” are referred to four times as “unbelievers”.³¹ Although they bear the “name” – probably “Christian” – they carry it with “wicked guile”. In reality they are “mad dogs” and “wild beasts” who are very difficult to heal.³² While it is true that those who are not called Christian are not of God, some, however, use the name without actually being Christian.³³ The teachings of these adversaries are “evil”. They are a “different doctrine or view” composed of “old fables”, a “poisonous oil”, “wicked arts”, and “the snares of the prince of this world”.³⁴ Their actions indicate a lack of expected compassion, of not caring either for love or the unlovely.³⁵ The consequences of following such teachings are the loss of the “Passion” and “Resurrection”, “the Kingdom of God” and

Henricus Kraft, *Clavis Patrum Apostolicorum* (Darmstadt, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1963) tends to indicate that at least in Ignatius the problem of “heresy” and “orthodoxy” was of concern.

³⁰ *Trallians* 6,1–7,2.

³¹ *Trallians* 10,1. *Trallians* 3,2 may refer to those in the larger culture rather than to the specific opponents. *Magnesians* 5,2; *Trallians* 10,1; *Smyrneans* 2,1 and 5,3 all refer to the antagonists as “unbelievers”. This collection of Ignatius’ descriptions of his adversaries may be assembled without regard to the question of whether or not he combatted one or two groups. The issue concerns the possibility of his having distinguished “inside” and “outside”. Virginia Corwin, *St. Ignatius and Christianity in Antioch*, Yale Publications in Religion, 1 (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1960) 52–87 is one of the most recent attempts to suggest at least two sets of opponents. Einar Molland, The Heretics Combated by Ignatius of Antioch, *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 5 (1954) 1–6 and L.W. Barnard, The Background of St. Ignatius of Antioch, *Vigiliae Christianae* 17 (1963) 193–206 suggest only one group.

³² *Ephesians* 7,1.

³³ *Magnesians* 4,1 and 10,1.

³⁴ *Ephesians* 9,1. 10,3. 16,1. 17,1; *Magnesians* 8,1; *Philadelphians* 3,1. 3,3. 6,2; *Smyrneans* 6,2; *Polycarp* 3,1. 5,1.

³⁵ *Smyrneans* 6,2.

"immortality", paralleled with the gain of "death" and "unquenchable fire".³⁶

The above texts serve to strengthen the suggestion that Ignatius does make a distinction between inside and outside and relegates his adversaries to a position outside the community of the faithful. Even stronger elements of his letters support this interpretation. Ignatius is the only person in this period who argued for the theological necessity of mon-episcopacy. Not only does he give a series of metaphors in which the relationship of bishop, presbyters and deacons are compared with divinity, heavenly beings, and apostles,³⁷ he also considers baptism and the Eucharist to be under the jurisdiction of the bishop. The Eucharist is the bread of God, the medicine of immortality. Unless a man is within the sanctuary, he lacks the bread of God. Only the Eucharist which is celebrated by the bishop or his appointee is both "secure and valid".³⁸ The implication is that those who participate in an "invalid" Eucharist do not receive immortality and do not share in the benefits of the faith. This implication corresponds to the description of the opponents and the consequences of their teachings.

To this point the evidence appears to demand a clear differentiation between Ignatius' friends and his enemies, which may have reached the point of separation in Tralles. Separation, however, does not appear to have been the usual situation in the cities to which Ignatius wrote. *Smyrneans* 6-8 probably provides the strongest statements about the validity of the Eucharist only under the jurisdiction of the bishop. The faithful are urged to refrain from contact with the adversaries, even to the point of not speaking of them in public or in private. This might appear to be an example of separation, particularly since Smyrna is the place in which Bauer envisioned the existence of counter meetings under a "gnostic anti-bishop".³⁹ Yet one must step back from this tantalizing suggestion of division by noting two important aspects of this passage. First, the antagonists have not been forced out of the Eucharist because of their understanding of it. They have not been excluded or excommunicated. Ignatius might have pictured them as absenting themselves from the service in order to put the onus of division on them. It is exactly at

³⁶ *Ephesians* 16,2 and 20,2; *Philadelphians* 3,3; *Smyrneans* 5,1. 7,1.

³⁷ *Ephesians* 3,2-6,1; *Magnesians* 2-3,2. 6,1-7,2. 13; *Trallians* 2,1-3,2. 12,2; *Philadelphians* insc., 1. 3,2. 7-8,1; *Smyrneans* 8-9,1; *Polycarp* insc., 5,2-6,1.

³⁸ *Ephesians* 5,2. 20,2; *Smyrneans* 8. Compare *Trallians* 7,2; *Magnesians* 4.

³⁹ Bauer, *Rechtgläubigkeit*, 73.

this point that he warns his supporters to "flee from divisions as the beginning of evils". This warning, however, is better explained by a second consideration. In this context Ignatius exhorts "all of them" to follow the bishop. There is still time for the offenders to return to soberness and to repent. Here is the practical application of Ignatius' aversion to division and his love of unity which is testified to throughout his letters.⁴⁰ One can see this reflected even in the vilest names he calls his adversaries. When they are viewed as "mad dogs" and "wild beasts" almost incapable of being healed, Ignatius mentions the "one Physician". The disruptive teachers from outside Ephesus are probably included in the "other men" for whom the Ephesians were to pray and to hope for repentance, living before them in love and gentleness so that they might become disciples of the faithful and thus find God. Similar advice was given to Polycarp in dealing with his antagonists.⁴¹

Within the letters, the tension between exclusion and inclusion cannot be resolved, not even by observing the differences in each individual community. Ignatius has the structure necessary to distinguish "heresy" and "orthodoxy". He describes who the opponents are, what they teach and how they act, and has theologically to his satisfaction justified a system of organization in which the bishop is in charge of the valid sacraments. The Trallian letter might be given as an instance of separation primarily because Ignatius offered no words of reconciliation in that epistle. It is always difficult, however, to prove that silence on a specific point is intentional. Ignatius' overall attempt appears to be to preserve unity, rather than to exclude impurity. Exclusion is an action which Ignatius accused his adversaries of taking, an action he only once suggested with no indication that those excluded were to be called to repentance. The opponents may have seen themselves as separate, that is, as not needing what Ignatius' supporters offered. On the other hand, Ignatius usually prays for their repentance and their return to the valid Eucharist. His letters do not indicate what is to be done with such people if they refuse to repent and to return to the bishop. The Trallian situation cannot be shown to be the way in which recalcitrant adversaries are to be handled since no previous attempt at reconciliation in that community can be established. Ignatius had taken a significant step, however, in

⁴⁰ *Magnesians* 1,2. 13,2; *Trallians* 11,2; *Philadelphians* 2,1. 3,2. 4. 7,2. 8,1; *Smyrneans* 7,2; *Polycarp* 1. s. 5,2.

⁴¹ *Ephesians* 7. 10; *Polycarp* 1-3.

distinguishing between "heresy" and "orthodoxy", although he offered no consistent position as to what must be done with unrepentant opposition. Polycarp gives no indication of separation, in spite of the use of strong language about his adversaries, and the possibility on Bauer's reading of his epistle, that he distinguished those presbyters who were with him from those who were not. Although his list of errors is quite scathing, he calls for moderation and repentance.⁴²

Bauer emphasized the lack of separation between "heresy" and "orthodoxy" in Ignatius and Polycarp as if there was no distinction made. Precisely because of Ignatius' concern for unity and reconciliation, as well as his interest in repentance and the restoration of peace, he probably did feel some kind of claim on all the baptized of Syria. Bauer, however, stressed one part of the position and then extended it as if it were conclusive. All the force of Ignatius' derisive names, his vilification of teachers and teachings, his organization of valid Eucharist under the bishop, and the lack of a word of reconciliation in the Trallian epistle indicate a distinction which could be the beginning of a justified separation, if the adversaries refused to repent and return to the bishop. Polycarp also uses strong names for his antagonists, and gives a concise list of errors to be combatted. Clear separation is to be found in neither of their writings, but they would have been leary of claiming their opponents as being anything but the most wayward of brothers.

Bauer's inability to grasp the difference between the beginning of a process and its fullest development led him to emphasize the lack of separation in Ignatius and Polycarp and to miss the attempts at distinction. His logic fell into the same trap when he insisted that the fullest development of monepiscopacy must be present in its beginning in order for it to exist at all. By positing that Ignatius would have needed to claim his opponents as "inside", Bauer intended to show that Ignatius would have had strong opposition from within. Because, in Bauer's view, a monarchical bishop should have had "unlimited power", and "full recognition" as well as never having been overcome with the ineffectiveness of his efforts, Ignatius was not the bishop of Syria.⁴³ Bauer's mention of the Gnostic teachers in Antioch only demonstrates that Ignatius was not a bishop, if Bauer's definitions of "inside" and "monepiscopacy" are

⁴² *Philippians* 2,1. 7. 11,4.

⁴³ Bauer, *Rechtgläubigkeit*, 71, 72, and 75.

accepted.⁴⁴ The major methodological error occurs in tightening the definition of "monepiscopacy" not only to demand its fullest development, but beyond this, to demand such characteristics of monepiscopacy that it would be difficult to find many bishops in any period of history. The imposition of an "ideal" definition kept Bauer from reading the evidence correctly. While in the available literature of this period, Ignatius offers the single example of theological arguments for the necessity of monepiscopacy, it is not likely that he himself originated the office in Asia Minor. His letters to the Ephesians, Magnesians, Trallians, Philadelphians, and Smyrneans argue for finer distinctions between bishop, presbyters and deacons than has previously existed. He does not need, however, to suggest or contend for a difference between the place of Onesimus, Apollonius, or Zotion. They are bishop, presbyter and deacon. Other persons are given with the respective titles. Such distinctions were recognizable to his readers. The Philadelphians are to appoint a deacon to be sent to Antioch. Neighboring churches have sent bishops, others, presbyters and deacons.⁴⁵ The strong case which Ignatius made for the theological and organizational significance of the bishop probably was new, but prior to his writing, the offices existed and were distinguished from each other in Asia Minor, and probably in Western Syria.

It has become evident, then, that Bauer has a tendency to use peculiar definitions of important terms, employing them with these meanings in

⁴⁴ Pp. 70-71. Bauer noticed the presence of Menander, Saturninus, Cerdo, and Basilides in Antioch around the time of Ignatius. But this information, although important, does not establish Bauer's claims about Ignatius, unless Ignatius must accept all these teachers as "Christian" and could not be a bishop with such opposition. Bauer has not demonstrated the strength of the groups following these Gnostics, nor that Ignatius would have accepted them without distinction as "Christian", nor that one can only be a bishop if one has no opponents.

Ehrhardt, *Christianity before the Apostles' Creed*, 180-181 criticizes Bauer's same arguments, but on other grounds. He views Ignatius as too Gnostic to represent the Antiochene community which produced the pseudo-Clementines. Heinrich Schlier, *Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu den Ignatiusbriefen*, Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, 8 (Giessen, Töpelmann, 1929) and Hans-Werner Bartsch, *Gnostisches Gut und Gemeindetradition bei Ignatius von Antiochien*, Beitrag zur Förderung christlicher Theologie, 2. Reihe, 44. Band (Gütersloh, C. Bertelsmann, 1940) most strongly argue for Gnostic influence in Ignatius. However, Hans Lietzmann, *A History of the Early Church*, Vol. I, trans. by Bertram Les Woolf (New York, Meridian Books, 1961) 236-248, Grant, *The Apostolic Fathers, Ignatius*, and Barnard, *The Background of St. Ignatius of Antioch*, contest the strength of such influence.

⁴⁵ *Ephesians* 1,3-2,1. 4,1; *Magnesians* 2; *Trallians* 1; *Philadelphians* insc., 10; *Smyrneans* 12,2.

such a fashion as to apparently strengthen his argumentation. Probably because of this tendency, the possibility of using the terms "heresy" and "orthodoxy" as he did for the beginning of the second century has been questioned. Bauer did employ the terms with sweeping inclusiveness.⁴⁶ If they are meant to imply later definitions, then they do not fit. If, however, they are inserted in discussions of this period to signify the beginning of those developments which led to later definitions, they then become important tools. Ignatius used forms of the terms and did make distinctions which might have led to eventual separation. What is called for in the study of the documents from this era is a closer and more accurate reading of the texts in relation to these terms. The "cutting edges" in the conflicts need to be found.⁴⁷ Suggesting that such terminology will only serve to confuse the issue, avoids the beginning of issues which are in the texts.

III. "ORTHODOXY" AS ROMAN

Bauer has been unable to demonstrate that what he terms "heresy" was prior to and/or stronger than "orthodoxy" in Antioch and Asia Minor. At the same time he has also been unable to establish that monepiscopacy did not exist in these regions. Furthermore, he has misunderstood the important distinctions between "heresy" and "orthodoxy" which appear in the literature and form a background for their later separation. Therefore, Antioch and Asia Minor represent areas in which "orthodoxy", although challenged by strong and influential adversaries, was not in disarray at the beginning of the second century. If that is true, then it can be brought directly to bear on Bauer's second thesis, i.e., that Rome alone

⁴⁶ Wilhelm Schneemelcher, Walter Bauer als Kirchenhistoriker, *New Testament Studies* 9,1 (1962) 18. Robert A. Kraft, The Reception of the Book, *Orthodoxy and Heresy*, 312-314 offers a series of penetrating questions and suggests the use of the terms should be limited to those points where they appear in the texts. Hans-Dietrich Altendorf, in his review of the second edition of Bauer, *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 91,3 (1966) 194 utters a warning concerning the difficulty of treating these issues.

⁴⁷ James M. Robinson, Kerygma and History in the New Testament, in: *Trajectories through Early Christianity* (Philadelphia, Fortress Press, 1971) recognizes the problems involved, but suggests that stopping the investigations at the level of overwhelming plurality may be another error of interpretation. Henry Chadwick, *Early Christian Thought and the Classical Tradition: Studies in Justin, Clement, and Origen* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1966) 123 notices that "the perennial issue" concerning Origen is his "orthodoxy". Yet when one asks that question of Origen, the prior question is raised, "what is the essence of orthodoxy?" Without pressing for the answers to the "orthodoxy" and "heresy" questions which Bauer posed concerning early Christian texts, it will be difficult to define these concepts.

was the important center of "orthodoxy" in the second century. Tracing Rome's unfolding influence on the "orthodox" movement in Christianity, Bauer viewed the North African intervention in c. 250, the support of Alexandrian bishop Demetrius against Origen in c. 230, Victor's attempt to cut off the Asia Minor churches in c. 190, the letter of Dionysius of Corinth to Soter in c. 180, and the encounter between Anicetus and Polycarp in c. 154 as examples of what Rome did with its intervention in Corinth through the first epistle of Clement. On the basis of his understanding of this development, Bauer saw Rome in the second century as "from the very beginning the center and chief source of power for the 'orthodox' movement".⁴⁸

There is certainly nothing methodologically illegitimate about tracing developments in one geographical area through a given period to see changes in opinion and action, as well as continuity of position and procedure. This must be considered one of the strongest points of Bauer's presentation. The claim, however, that "orthodoxy" stems from Rome will have to be supported both by the lack of influential bases elsewhere, and the proof that I Clement interposes its interest on Corinth in a way dissimilar to that of other literature of its period, and quite similar to later Roman interventions. The deficiency of important centers of "orthodoxy" has been contested above. It is, however, significant to notice how Bauer fails to grasp the similarities of I Clement and related literature of this period. He sets the stage for his interpretation of I Clement by indicating that its interest in another center is much like that of other writings from the period, and then claims I Clement to be the basis of the peculiar Roman position of intervention.⁴⁹ He does not discuss I Peter, which is also probably from Rome and is concerned with particular regions of Asia Minor. This would indicate not only a concern on the part of Rome for Corinth, as I Clement testifies, but also in Asia Minor. Bauer noted the apparently Roman influence on some of the Asia Minor literature, particularly in the coupling of Peter and Paul as the symbol of apostolic leadership, and the development of the later pseudo-Clementines in Antioch.⁵⁰ On the other hand, the Pastorals and the Apocalypse give

⁴⁸ Bauer, *Rechtgläubigkeit*, 231.

⁴⁹ Pp. 93-98.

⁵⁰ Pp. 115-133 particularly indicate Roman influence throughout the Mediterranean. Karlmann Beyschlag, *Clemens Romanus und der Fröhhkatholizismus*, Beiträge zur historischen Theologie, 35 (Tübingen, J.C.B. Mohr/Paul Siebeck, 1966) extensively confirms such influence.

evidence of cross influences of various centers in Asia Minor. Polycarp wrote to Philippi in Macedonia in response to a letter from that community. Ignatius shows a wide geographical range of influence and concern. He not only wrote to instruct communities in Western Asia Minor about faith and practices, but also sent an epistle to Rome with instructions not to interfere in his martyrdom. The occasion of his writings was his journey to suffer death, but he used that opportunity to influence the various communities he wrote. The tone of the Roman letter is more favorable than any of the others. Ignatius does not hesitate, however, to warn that community of the consequences if they interfere in his going to God through the martyr's act. Nor does he fail to assert his own position as bishop of Syria paralleled to Rome's position in its region.⁵¹ The literature of this period shows a pattern of territorial intervention or interpenetration from many Christian centers.

Furthermore, there are five important contributions which Asia Minor and Antioch made to orthodoxy – contributions which would most likely appear in a detailed definition of "orthodoxy". First, monepiscopacy may have originated in Jerusalem where it developed through an hereditary succession.⁵² The cities represented in Ignatius' letters indicate the presence of the office with no hereditary overtones and distinguished from presbyters and deacons, before Ignatius wrote. Monepiscopacy, however, is not in evidence in Rome at the beginning of the second century.⁵³ Secondly, the theological justification of the place of the bishop in the life of the church is first visible in Ignatius, rather than in a Roman author. The conception of apostolic succession is not found in Ignatius, and does appear in I Clement.⁵⁴ Yet nothing from early second century Rome can equal the claim which Ignatius makes for monarchical episcopacy. Thirdly, the distinctions between "heresy" and "orthodoxy" which Ignatius used are beginnings which could later be pressed toward separation if oppo-

⁵¹ *Romans* insc., 2. 8,3.

⁵² Hegesippus in Eusebius, *H.E.* 4,22,4 notices this familial relationship.

⁵³ The burden of proof for monepiscopacy in Rome at the beginning of the second century rests on the one arguing that case, since all the evidence speaks either of a plural episcopate, or none at all. I Clement 42 mentions bishops (59,3 uses the singular form of the word for God) as does Hermas *Vis.* 3,5,1 and *Sim.* 9,27,2. Ignatius' *Romans* neither argues for monepiscopacy nor mentions a bishop in that city. William Telfer, *The Office of Bishop* (London, Darton, Longman & Todd, 1962) 43–88 suggests that the acceptance of monepiscopacy by Rome involved a significant theological shift from the position represented at the end of the first century.

⁵⁴ I Clement 42.

nents remained rebellious. These early distinctions are not so clearly marked in the Roman literature of the period. Bauer himself thought an example of separation could be found in I John, a text which is usually ascribed to Asia Minor.⁵⁵ Fourthly, canonical developments can be seen in this region also. Marcion appears to have been the first to consciously create a canon. Asia Minor also may have a prior claim to the creation of four gospels.⁵⁶ Finally, the first liturgical texts appear to come from Syria, particularly in the form of manuals like the *Didache*. For some reason Bauer never discussed the *Didache*. It seems, therefore, highly unlikely that the spread of "orthodoxy", seen by Bauer as emanating from Rome with its organizational genius,⁵⁷ would have been functional at its heights in later centuries without moniscopacy developed beyond hereditary connections, theologically argued, coupled with a separation between heresy and orthodoxy, a four gospel canon, and a regularized liturgy: all Syrian and Asia Minor contributions.

Bauer's second thesis is called into question because he did not recognize the strength of centers elsewhere in the Mediterranean and their contributions to the development of "orthodoxy". He also has a questionable tendency, however, to read lines of development backwards, seeing later events in earlier texts. He based the third century interventions of Rome in the first century epistle of I Clement. Yet the evidence from the second century does not demand that Rome imposed its will on other areas far removed from its local concerns until the dramatic action of Victor. The Paschal controversy of 154 is a case in point. The difficulty seems to have involved immigrants from Asia Minor, who, after settling in the vicinity of Rome, continued to celebrate Easter according to the date and customs of their homeland. Anicetus was trying to establish a uniform practice in his own region, not attempting to intervene in Asia Minor. The immigrants apparently appealed to their champion, Polycarp. We do not know the exact circumstances under which he came to Rome, but there is no evidence that he was summoned there by Anicetus. While

⁵⁵ Bauer, *Rechtgläubigkeit*, 96. Bauer argues wrongly, p. 91, that the difference between Jewish and Gentile Christians in Asia Minor becomes a difference between "orthodoxy" and "heresy" in the late first or early second centuries. If he were correct, his observation would be a further contribution of the area to a classical definition of "heresy" and "orthodoxy".

⁵⁶ Hans Freiherr von Campenhausen, *Die Entstehung der christlichen Bibel*, Beiträge zur historischen Theologie, 39 (Tübingen, J.C.B. Mohr/Paul Siebeck, 1968) 174/206, particularly 202.

⁵⁷ Bauer, *Rechtgläubigkeit*, 232-233.

there, Polycarp tried to convince Anicetus of the correctness of the Asia Minor custom just as much as Anicetus tried to convince him of the correctness of the Roman custom. Both failed, and did not agree on everything, but parted in peace. Anicetus even invited Polycarp to celebrate the Eucharist.⁵⁸ Since this was Roman territory, the stronger argument most probably came from Polycarp and the Asia Minor contingent. They were not merely left in peace to follow their own customs. They practiced them in the Roman region. Bauer is incorrect to suppose that in these events the Roman powers were strategically biding their time until Asia Minor weakened.⁵⁹

It must not be assumed, however, that all such confrontations between Rome and other areas were to have these mixed resolutions. Rome was a very important center. The letters of Dionysius of Corinth well indicate that the economic power of Rome and the influence which came from that strength had penetrated the empire. Dionysius not only praises I Clement, but congratulates Soter on following and even advancing the Roman custom of sending supplies for the poor and those in the mines.⁶⁰ Such assistance made a profound impression on Dionysius, and doubtless carried some theological implications. We are, however, unaware of exactly what those pressures toward "orthodox" development were.⁶¹

Victor's actions were the strongest. The Paschal question had evidently become more acute throughout the Mediterranean basin. Eusebius suggests that there were a number of synods, and specifically mentions ones in Jerusalem, Rome, Pontus, Gaul, and Osrene. Only Victor, however, made the attempt to cut off as unorthodox those who did not agree. This may have been due to his North African heritage which looked to Rome for much of its leadership.⁶² In any case, such action is a clear indication of his sense of power and authority, but it was not an action

⁵⁸ Eusebius, *H.E.* 5,24,16–17.

⁵⁹ Bauer, *Rechtgläubigkeit*, 131.

⁶⁰ Eusebius, *H.E.* 4,23,10.

⁶¹ Bauer, *Rechtgläubigkeit*, 125–126 suggests on the basis of this letter that in 95 during the problems which prompted the writing of I Clement, the Romans sent money to support the former leadership in Corinth. It is an interesting conjecture, but not a demonstrable position.

⁶² Bernhard Lohse, *Das Passafest der Quartadecimaner*, Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie, 2. Reihe, 54. Band (Gütersloh, C. Bertelsmann, 1953) 122–127. He follows Bauer, *Rechtgläubigkeit*, 14 in suggesting that the existence of a synod in Osrene is questionable. Cyril Richardson, A New Solution to the Quartodeciman Riddle, *Journal of Theological Studies* (1973) 74–84 proposes further distinctions among the Quartodeciman parties.

which occurred without being vigorously contested. Eusebius quotes not only the replies representing various bishops from Asia Minor, notably Polycrates of Ephesus, but also the interesting correspondence of Irenaeus.⁶³ There is little doubt that Rome should be seen as one of the most important centers of "orthodoxy" and one of the most vital sources of its power throughout the second century. That is particularly true in the deeds of Victor, and the tradition of almsgiving which Dionysius recognized as having a history prior to Soter. Even then, the contribution and influence of other regions in the development of orthodoxy must not be underplayed. Irenaeus, who viewed Rome as the type of all orthodox churches, was himself from Asia Minor and as a young man had listened to Polycarp. Irenaeus ministered in Gaul to an area which was strongly influenced by immigrants from Asia Minor.⁶⁴ As one of the major architects of orthodoxy and opponents of heresy, he refuted Victor's right to excommunicate the churches in Asia Minor and to make them alter their apostolic customs. The beginnings of Roman dominance in orthodoxy might be found in the lifetime of Victor, but neither the Anicetus-Polycarp meeting, nor the intervention of Rome in Corinth through the epistle of I Clement indicates such dominance. Therefore, Bauer's second thesis fails to stand up to scrutiny because he underrated the strength and influence of centers in Asia Minor and Syria, and because by imputing later developments into his interpretations of earlier ones, he pushed Roman centrality back to a point in history where it did not exist.

CONCLUSION

Walter Bauer's negative assessment of the classical theory of heresy has been accepted by many scholars. The daring quality of his position in 1934 must not be forgotten. The fallacy of both his positive theses, however, has not been properly emphasized. At the beginning of the second

⁶³ Eusebius, *H.E.* 5,23-24.

⁶⁴ The account of the Gaulican martyrs in Eusebius *H.E.* 5,1,17 mentions "Attalus, a native of Pergamum". 5,1,49 speaks of "Alexander, a Phrygian by race ... who had lived for many years among the Gauls". The fact that the letter is addressed to Asians and Phrygians is probably due to an immigration of Christians from those areas to Gaul. Irenaeus claims to have seen and listened to Polycarp in *Adv. Haer.* 3,3,4) and in his letter to Florinus in Eusebius, *H.E.* 5,20. Norbert Brox, *Offenbarung, Gnosis und gnostischer Mythos bei Irenäus von Lyon. Zur Charakteristik der Systeme*, Salzburger patristische Studien des internationalen Forschungszentrums für Grundfragen der Wissenschaft, 1 (Salzburg-München: A. Pustet, 1966) 144-150 questions the exactness of Irenaeus' memory of these details about Polycarp, but supports Polycarp's influence on Irenaeus.

century, Antioch and Asia Minor give evidence of "orthodox" communities which had opponents, but have not been proved either to be minorities or to be in danger of extermination. When the strength and contributions of these centers to the development of orthodoxy is recognized, it is impossible to see Rome as the dominant center of "orthodoxy" at the beginning of the second century. Therefore, in assessing Bauer's work, even though details are conceded as incorrect, it should not be asserted that the major premise of the book stands.⁶⁵ The negative attack on the classical theory of heresy stands, but the positive reconstructions fall.

In criticizing Bauer's work, it is important to recognize that a number of his arguments are conjecture based on silence.⁶⁶ Historians of early Christianity could well learn to distinguish between evidence and lack of evidence, and more freely admit the latter. On the other hand, to avoid working in the gaps is not possible, since we possess such a small fragment of the materials which once existed. It is entirely legitimate to search for methods through which groups now without the witnesses they once had, are allowed, in fact enabled to speak. Bauer's major methodological errors, however, are not confined merely to the treatment of silence. A large proportion occur in his treatment of the texts. He postulates a democratic council in which "orthodoxy" was a threatened minority in order to explain Ignatius' concern and argumentation for moniscopacy, but is unable to demonstrate that Ignatius' supporters were a minority in any of the communities associated with Ignatius or that they did not have

⁶⁵ Kraft, *The Reception of the Book*, 314-316 indicates that "there is much in Bauer's treatment that invites supplementation or reassessment" but makes the comment under the heading of "Specific Details". Yet he recognizes that a "fresh approach" to "North Africa, Rome and other western regions", "Asia Minor and the Aegean area", and "the whole question of east Syrian Christianity" is in order. Helmut Koester, *GNOMAI DIAPHOROI: The Origin and Nature of Diversification in the History of Early Christianity, Trajectories through Early Christianity*, 114 claims that "Bauer was essentially right" particularly in light of the Nag Hammadi discoveries.

⁶⁶ Kraft, *The Reception of the Book*, 311 is correct to insist that "*ad hominem* blasts and apologetic counter-charges" will not advance the state of the problems. Bauer cannot be dismissed because he is "conjectural". It will prove more rewarding to study the texts and create new interpretations. Investigating the texts, however, indicates that Bauer's two major theses may be rejected precisely because of the methodological problems which Kraft mentions, i.e., "that Bauer has sometimes used language suggesting more confidence in his reconstruction than the evidence would seem to warrant, and that sometimes there is no direct evidence to support his interpretation, or he has overgeneralized on the basis of ambiguous data." More damaging is the indication that he has misread the texts.

bishops. He uses terms such as "monepiscopacy", "orthodoxy", and "heresy" and strengthens or weakens their meanings according to his theory. The basic error is in reading history backwards, either by demanding that the fullest or even "ideal" stage of a development must be present at its beginning in order for it to exist, or by imposing later events on earlier ones to support his interpretations. Frankly, he misreads the texts. One should be cautious in following his lead in places where there are few texts and much silence, when it can be demonstrated that he does not proceed on good grounds with the existent texts.

Positively, Bauer divides his study into areas, attempting to treat each individually. It is perhaps wise to concentrate our efforts even further by investigating separate cities within these areas. Bauer is also to be followed in researching the lines of development of "orthodoxy" and "heresy" in early Christianity. We may take the lead of Dobschütz not only in reading the individual hermeneutic of each document, but also in sketching the social, economic, and political environment of the communities which stand behind the documents.⁶⁷ In viewing the importance of the various regions over against each other, we would do well to continue research into the traditions behind such architects of orthodoxy as Irenaeus.⁶⁸ In

⁶⁷ Ernst von Dobschütz, *Vom Auslegen des Neuen Testaments* (Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1927) 16 suggests the investigation of the New Testament literature with a view to the individual hermeneutic of each book. That could profitably be expanded to all early Christian texts. His *Christian Life in the Primitive Church*, trans. by George Bemner and ed. by W. D. Morrison (New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1904) studies early Christian ethics in terms of its social setting. For a penetrating analysis of the need for this latter approach see Leander E. Keck, On the Ethos of Early Christianity, *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 42,3 (1974) 435-452. Keck and Wayne A. Meeks chair a group of the American Academy of Religion and the Society of Biblical Literature which is studying the social world of Christianity in Antioch of Syria in the first four centuries. See Meeks, The Social World of Early Christianity, *The Council on the Study of Religion Bulletin* 6,1 (February, 1975) 1, 4-5. Edwin A. Judge, St. Paul and Classical Society, *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum* 15 (1972) 19-36 gives an excellent survey of the possibilities for such investigations. The Disciples Institut zur Erforschung des Urchristentums, Tübingen, Germany is investigating Christianity in its urban environments in Antioch of Syria, Corinth and Ephesus.

⁶⁸ André Benoit, *Saint Irénée: Introduction à l'Étude de sa Théologie* (Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, 1960) 9-41 reviews the problem of sources with an interest in defending a synthetic attempt to study Irenaeus' theology. Brox, *Offenbarung*, 105-167 deals with these questions with a view to explaining Irenaeus, while Martin Widmann, Irenäus und seine theologischen Väter, *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 54,2 (1957) 156-173 attempts to find a way between portraying Irenaeus as a dull traditioner or the first systematic theologian. We should avoid a concept as broad as an "Asia Minor Theology" which Friedrich Loofs, *Theophilus von Antiochien 'Adversus Marcionem' und*

this way historians indebted to Bauer's attempts can move beyond his efforts toward better reconstructions of early Christianity.⁶⁹

Tübingen, Wilhelmstrasse 100,
Disciples Institut zur Erforschung des Urchristentums

die anderen theologischen Quellen bei Irenaeus, Texte und Untersuchungen, 46,2 (Leipzig, J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1930) began to propose. But the contributions of that region to the formation of orthodoxy in one such as Irenaeus and the influence Antioch may have had on Asia Minor merit the continued study of what theological themes dominated the churches in those areas.

⁶⁹ Helmut Koester's GNOMAI DIAPHOROI, *Trajectories*, 114–157 is a stimulating piece which deserves attention. What is probably most needed is more penetrating work on specific areas, as the Research Team for the Religion and Culture of the Aegean in Early Christian Times and its newsletter, *Numina Aegaea* indicate Koester is pursuing.